

REMARKS

Claims 1-36 were originally presented for examination. Claims 1-6 and 29-36 have been withdrawn pursuant to a restriction requirement. By this amendment, claims 9 and 20 have been canceled and incorporated into claims 7 and 18, respectively, leaving claims 7-8, 10-19, and 21-28 pending and at issue in the present application. In view of the amendments and remarks presented herein, reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested.

As an initial matter, Applicants note that the foregoing amendment to the specification corrects an obvious typographical error. Consideration and entry of this amendment are respectfully requested.

Turning to the Office action, all pending claims 41-52 stand rejected as obvious over Spindler et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,509,538). Applicants traverse this ground of rejection.

Independent claims 7 and 18, and claims 8, 10-17, 19, and 21-27 dependent directly or indirectly thereon, have been amended to recite stock item order apparatus having, *inter alia*, a direction display operably coupled to a computer, wherein the computer operates the direction display to indicate a direction of a storage bin associated with a subsequent order. As a result, a stock worker is given advance notice of the general area of the storage bin for the subsequent order pick, and therefore can more quickly and efficiently move to that area after completing the current pick.

It is not seen that Spindler et al. address the same problem, let alone offer the solution of the presently claimed apparatus. Instead, Spindler et al. disclose a paperless order picking system having an operator display unit (ODU) for providing information to the stock worker. The ODUs may be carried by cars 22 or may be positioned at pick ends 18 of flow racks 12. As shown in FIG. 2 of Spindler et al., each ODU includes a keyboard 36 for input, a pick

display 38 for identifying a quantity of item to pick, a location display 40 for identifying the location of the current item to pick, a put zone indicator 46 for identifying where the items are to be placed, and a put display 44 for identifying the number of items to be placed in the designated put zone. Accordingly, while Spindler et al. broadly discloses an indicator system, it does not disclose or suggest any indicator providing information regarding a subsequent pick, let alone a direction indicator for indicating the general area of the storage bin for the subsequent pick item.

The prior art must disclose at least a suggestion of an incentive for a claimed combination of elements in order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. No such suggestion is apparent from the cited reference and hence the obviousness rejection should be withdrawn. See In re Sernaker, 217 USPQ 1 (Fed. Cir. 1983) and Ex parte Clapp, 227 USPQ 972, 973 (Bd. Pat. App. 1985)

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 7-8, 10-19, and 21-28 as now presented in the application are in good and proper form for allowance. A favorable action on the part of the Examiner is respectfully solicited.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

By: Brent E. Matthias
Brent E. Matthias, Reg. No. 41,974
Attorneys for Applicant
6300 Sears Tower
233 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6402
(312) 474-6300

November 26, 2003